



PROJECT MUSE®

What Is in a Term? A Historical and Linguistic Examination
of the Revolutionary Terminology: *ywdām* , “let it be
demolished, down with,” 1974–1977

Semeneh Ayalew, Binyam Sisay Mendisu

Northeast African Studies, Volume 13, Number 1, 2013 (New Series), pp.
53-70 (Article)

Published by Michigan State University Press

DOI: <https://doi.org/10.1353/nas.2013.0008>



➔ *For additional information about this article*

<https://muse.jhu.edu/article/516622>



SHOUT
SHARE **IT**

What Is in a Term? A Historical and Linguistic Examination of the Revolutionary Terminology: *ywdäm*, “let it be demolished, down with,” 1974–1977

SEMENEH AYALEW, *Institute of Ethiopian Studies, Addis Ababa University*
BINYAM SISAY MENDISU, *Department of Linguistics, Addis Ababa University*

ABSTRACT

*This paper attempts to subject revolutionary terminology to understand the extent of reinterpretation of newly introduced terms by the local language and culture. It also would like to draw scholarly attention to the link between terminology and political action during the early years of the Ethiopian revolution, 1974–1977. It has four sections and starts with a discussion of the context in which revolutionary terminology is proposed to be studied and a section on theories of space and the situatedness of language that lays out the conceptual frame of the study. This section is followed by a discussion of literature on terminology. Then, a frequently used revolutionary term, *ywdäm*, “let it be demolished, down with,” during the time under discussion will be examined in some detail, and this will be followed by a brief conclusion.*

The Context

In this section of the paper, we will try to situate the discussion of terms and political discourse in a context. We argue that understanding the context in which society uses language is extremely vital in studying terminology and political discourse in general and revolutionary terminology in particular. By context, we are referring to urban space and the socio-historical condition in which terms were coined, used, and redefined in the early years of the Ethiopian revolution. We will try to do this by informing our study of revolutionary terminology and their impact on political action with discussions from theories of space and theories that try to situate utterances and discourse in the context of social relations.

Before we go to theoretical nuances, it is necessary for us to point out briefly the historical context that gave birth to the introduction of revolutionary terminology in Ethiopia. After a brief discussion of the historical context, we will turn to showing the relationship between the above-mentioned theories of space and the social situatedness of utterances/language with the study of revolutionary terminology. This section is, therefore, divided into two sub-sections; one that deals with the historical context, and another devoted to theoretical discussions.

The Historical and Political Context

The 1974 Ethiopian revolution is a watershed in terms of the writing of the chief issues of Ethiopian contemporary politics. The revolution also saw a massive introduction of new terms, concepts, and ideas such as *lab addär*, “the toiling people,” *sārto addär*, “working people,” *s’ärä həzb* (equivalent to the concept of “enemy of the people”), *č’əqqun həzb*, “the oppressed masses,” *māret larašu*, “land to the tiller,” *yābəher t’iyyaqe*, “the nationality question,” etc., that defined and changed the political vocabulary of the country in an enduring fashion. The period between 1974 and 1977 evidenced an unprecedented freedom of expression and the flourishing of various political organizations. This period also witnessed the coinage, translation, and use of new revolutionary terms and concepts.¹

Some scholars concluded that the tragic events that followed the outbreak of the revolution—the Red Terror and White Terror—and the resulting antagonistic relations between the various political groupings and a political culture

infested with intolerance and extremism, were caused by the espousal of radical Leftist ideology.² Even if there is no denying that radical Leftist ideology legitimates violence as an important means of solving political differences, and this, therefore, had influenced hostile relationship between the various political organizations, this study is meant to show that extremism and a culture of intolerance are not products solely of Leftist radical ideology.

The contention that socialism as a philosophical tool to organize society economically, socially, and politically has not been properly understood and adapted by the political elite to fit the local context is correct. But this does not mean that no domestication of foreign Leftist terms and concepts had been made. This study attempts to show that there was and is bound to be a certain level of reinterpretation of concepts borrowed and introduced from outside. During the time under study, borrowed concepts and terms brought new meanings and introduced new concepts and ideals to the country's political discourse and its cultural repertoire. However, the existing culture also enacted on the newly introduced terms and concepts by reinterpreting them and played a part in the redefinition of their meanings and representation. This was because any society can understand a new concept by associating elements of the new concept with cultural elements in its own linguistic and cultural repertoire. Such reinterpretation of meaning was also registered during translation of foreign concepts into the local language of discourse (in this case Amharic) as well as a result of conscious modifications made by those formulating political language.

Thus, the agency of the dominant traditional culture should be appreciated in guiding as well as determining the kind of political culture the country has in modern times. The examination of revolutionary terminology could extensively help in explaining why political discourse during the revolution turned the way it did, and whether the use of these terms has led to the bloodbath of the revolution.

Ngugi Wa Thiong'o in his *Something Torn and New* shows that languages are "sites" of memory and remembrance of a people's/nation's past. We can extend this further to argue that terms are sites of remembrance and memory. The study of terms could, therefore, serve as a bridge between the past and the present, in the sense that terms/words carry traces of the past. By trying to excavate the meaning of old terms and documenting their bearings when used in modern discourse can be one way of understanding political culture. When studying terminology, however, we should also be aware of the social relations

and the historical context that gives rise to terms as well as the discourse that they are part of. Terms are reused, coined, or retrieved from the existing corpus lexicon in response to the social and political needs of the time.

But even then, a term should not be seen in isolation. Sets of political terminology budding at a certain point in history are reflective of the kind of political discourse extant during the time of their emergence. In analyzing a term, therefore, we have to be acutely aware of the historical context and sets of relations that impact the tone in which they are used. These terms should be seen in light of their pragmatic meaning, i.e., they should be understood in terms of the context in which they are used. The dominant language of discourse in our period, Amharic, has continued for centuries as a court language and lingua franca in the Ethiopian empire. The culture that nurtured Amharic needs to be taken into account in analyzing political discourse and culture in revolutionary Ethiopia.

Like many other revolutions, the Ethiopian revolution was basically an urban phenomenon. Urban centers served as places where revolutionary terminology and discourse were formulated due to their proximity to the media, state power, and the possibility they proved for political association. They provide access to the radio, education, and newspapers, as well as centers of cultural expression. The first three years of the revolution also saw the emergence of a number of political organizations and parties. These years led to ideologically driven, hostile debates between the various political groupings. However, these years of political activity finally culminated in assassination and counter-assassination and severe political repression by the military junta in power. This is why urban centers become vital in our discussion of the first three years of the revolution. Revolutionary discourse in this sense is, therefore, also a function of urban centers. This makes revolutionary discourse a product of the historical time and the social relations embedded in space. We have hence identified in this paper space, time, and social context as the most important factors that determine political language as well as political action.

The Place of Urban Space and “Embedded” “Social Time” in the Study of Terms and Utterance

The “Embeddedness” of Utterance/Language

Pierre Bourdieu, in his approach to understand utterances commonly known as “theory of practice,” draws intellectual attention to the social and

political implications of communication and political language and argues that utterances are socially situated. This approach appraises the language theory that the British linguist J. L. Austin called speech-act by introducing a sociological approach to understanding language use. As a result, he argues that utterances are a product of factors extrinsic to language. Bourdieu contends that speech-acts are socially situated, and they are utterances that are products of the larger social structure, and therefore “bear the traces of the social structure that [they] both express and help to produce.”³ Drawing on Bourdieu, we also argue that not only were revolutionary terms products of the society that produced them, but that they also carry the social and cultural attributes of the dominant group as well as its psyche. On the other hand, however, we also would like to draw scholarly attention to the implications of political language, particularly revolutionary terminology in producing political reality and guiding political action.

Holloway and Kneale in their reading of Bakhtin also demonstrate that any utterance, be it written or orally performed, has to follow a protocol acceptable and conventional to a certain context. The tone of the language of communication or discourse is reflective of such conventions. Moreover, every utterance is bound to be “dialogical.” Utterances are by their nature relational, and one speech or communication performance is a response or reaction or affirmation of certain sets of utterances and communications. Thus, in trying to understand communication performance or utterances, we have to situate them in their socio-historical context, as they could not be understood in isolation. Context in this sense also means the context in which “competing ideologies and interests” play out.⁴

Any utterance or speech act is registered as a response to or an affirmation of the utterance that came before it. Every utterance is a product of what can be called the “social time and space”—the historical and social context and place where it is uttered.

... [every] utterance is “double voiced” in the sense that both the Self’s and Other’s voices interpenetrate the utterance: the utterance is thus “internally dialogized.” The subjects’ own utterance meets the (alien) word of the other, as the latter is always anticipated and/or incorporated into the former.⁵

This makes every utterance dialogical and situated in space. Therefore, the utterances of the revolutionaries in the media are responses to each other, affirmations of one's own political turf and incorporate past voices, or anticipate reactions from their opponents. Moreover, the political culture of the dominant language of discourse and the social and political relations attendant to it (what can be called Amharic culture) impacts both the content/meaning and tone of contemporary political language and discourse.

Language used by those in power and authority, politicians and political organizations that command popular support, or in short the “positionality” of the people making the utterances, could determine political action. Such utterances reflect the political “terrain” as well as conflicts and stand points of the major actors at a certain historical moment.⁶ Such utterances (by people assuming political authority or those who command political power outside of the state apparatus) by nature, guide and impact actual events and, thus, have concrete political implications. Political language and action are inseparably intertwined and reinforce each other. The owner of utterances, who is responsible for it, determines its actualization and has a direct bearing on action. This means utterances of politicians, whether written or orally performed, have a greater tendency to translate into political action. The horrors of the “Red Terror” by the Derg and the concomitant response by the civilian opposition, which is characterized in the literature of revolution as “White Terror,” are quintessential examples of the translatability of word into action in the period under study.

The Place of Urban Space in Political Discourse

The urban space is full of artifacts and instruments with “possibilities” where authority could be questioned. It provides instruments of control for the ruling classes and the state. The state can make use of the media, the police force, and its bureaucracy to ensure social control and conformity. At the same time, urban centers afford non-state actors access to the media, greater possibilities of association and assembly, and robust cultural activity.⁷ Like all spaces, the urban space is also “produced,” as Henry Lefebvre points out to us. Rather than being a “thing in itself,” space is a product of social, economic, and political phenomenon. Like other spaces, urban space should, thus, be understood in its relations to other aspects of life.⁸ The

urban space is, therefore, produced as a result of socioeconomic and political relations.

We recognize that the concept of the “urban” can sometimes be reified by academics in ways that do not recognize the “transaction” between the “urban” and the “rural.” The urban-rural divide at times fails to grasp the porous nature of this division. For instance, urban spaces during the period under study formulated their political agendas by incorporating issues that are fundamentally rural, such as “land to the tiller.” In this study, without disregarding the close interplay between the two spaces, we would like to foreground the urban as a space where political discourse is formulated and fervent political activity was carried out. It is in this sense that we accentuate the place of the urban in the Ethiopian revolution during the period under study.

The importance we attach here in understanding urban space is concerned with showing the pivotal role that urban spaces play in the formulation and dissemination of political discourse. The fact that the “White” and “Red” Terror were unleashed primarily in urban centers leading to the killing primarily of the young and urban was not just a coincidence.⁹ Rather, this demonstrates the vitality and the central place that urban centers played in political discourse and activism during the early years of the revolution and beyond. They served as centers of political activism, debate, and hostile and blazing political warfare that gave the revolutionary “fire-brands” not only their dogged determination to disparage their opponents unsparingly, but also the will to annihilate them when circumstances permit.

Translation, Borrowing, and Revolutionary Terminology

With the introduction of new terms into Amharic in the years leading up to and during the revolution, translation of new concepts and foreign terms has become a very important concern among academicians and politicians. One such effort was the writing of the so-called *Tāramaj mǝzgǎbǎ qalat* (*Progressive Dictionary*) published in 1969 EC (October 1976). The purpose of this dictionary was to find “precise translations of Marxist terminology” to ensure that there was a common understanding and application of terms.

Moreover, there were also attempts by literary people and politicians to translate Marxist-Leninist terminology into languages other than Amharic. Among such attempts was the Eritrean Peoples Liberation Front's preparation of a Tigrigna dictionary entitled *Mahdärä qalat* that came out in 1975 and the attempt by *Barissa* (a newspaper in Oromiffa) that translated 700 political terms into Oromiffa.¹⁰

In addition to dictionaries prepared by political groups to come up with standard definitions of Marxist-Leninist terminology, there have also been academic works on terminology in general and revolutionary terminology in particular. One such important attempt in this regard is the article by Olga Kapeliuk on "Marxist Leninist Terminology in Amharic and Tigrigna" published in 1979. According to Kapeliuk, 27 percent of the terms used in the *Progressive Dictionary* (30 out of a total of 110 terms) are borrowed from foreign languages. Another 25 percent of the terms in this dictionary are what Kapeliuk calls "redefined" terms, terms that have already been in existence in the Amharic corpus lexicon but had been reframed or "redefined" to carry a new desired meaning (such as *mädäb* to mean "class"). She argues that borrowing, redefining already existing words to carry a desired meaning, derivation (creation of terms by using root Amharic words and adding a suffix on them to carry a new meaning, e.g., *ma'äkäl* [center or central]) and adding the suffix *-awinnät* to mean "centralism" (*ma'äkäl-awinnät*), and borrowing Ge'ez words to come up with new terminology, are the four major ways by which new terms have been introduced into Amharic in this dictionary.¹¹

It has also been observed by other scholars that Amharic has the "tendency" to produce local expressions for foreign loan terms.¹² Amharic found local expressions for loan terms and used their Amharic equivalents interchangeably with the loan terms. This facilitated localization of the loan terms and their domestication and synthesis with the already existing local "linguistic and conceptual repertoire" of the Amharic language. Moreover, some of the newly introduced terms had even come to have more than one local expression, which shows that terms had been tamed to express a local reality. Amharic has, therefore, been dynamic and has manipulated these terms to fit its own cultural reality.¹³ Therefore, even for loan terms, at least some of them, Amharic had been able to find local corollaries, and by doing so, it was able to reinterpret their meanings to the local context.

This aspect of domestication further facilitated Amharic's preference to borrow terms from Ge'ez to translate and frame foreign concepts (in much the same way that Latin has been used to coin new concepts in English and other European languages). This had been a trend since the beginning of the twentieth century, with the beginning and preponderance of modern education and the modern media, and has continued to this date.¹⁴ Ge'ez had also been used by student publications in the pre-revolution period to express new concepts as a way of expressing pride in their own language and culture.¹⁵ Borrowed Ge'ez terms and concepts to express foreign terms has for instance been more numerous, as Kapeliuk notes, in the *Progressive Dictionary*, than the Tigrigna *Mahdärä qalat* dictionary, and they constitute about 20 percent of the total number of definitions in *Täramaj mäzgäbä qalat*.¹⁶ This substantial borrowing from Ge'ez is an important showcase of domestication and application of Marxist-Leninist terms into the local milieu.

The philosophical aspects of Amharic, a language that existed as a *lingua franca* for many hundreds of years has been highly influenced by the Ethiopian Orthodox Church and Ge'ez, its liturgical language. Ge'ez (the classical language of Ethiopia), due to its intense association with the Ethiopian Orthodox Church, has come to carry a heavy religious overtone. This religious overtone of Ge'ez is bound to influence the way concepts are framed in Amharic with Ge'ez loan terms. Meanings carried in terms that had been used in an older, different context are therefore another way by which old meanings persist in new terms.¹⁷

Critical Examination of the Term *wäddämä*, “be demolished”

A critical linguistic and historical examination of some of the local terms employed in slogans and other revolutionary discourse during the time of the Ethiopian revolution is hoped to serve as a window to see the link between political language/terminology and political action. We argue that terms could also “bear the traces” of old meaning and, thus, could be used to analyze continuity of meaning and culture of discourse.

This study uses one term, *ywdäm*, “let it be demolished, down with,” as an example and subjects it to linguistic examination, as well as attempt to trace its evolution of meaning and semantic construction. By doing this, we attempt to show two features of revolutionary terminology. One is that

terms are products of the spatial and historical milieu that produced them, i.e., the urban setting as a place where terms and political discourse are cast and the time of revolution that impacted the tone and substance of political language/utterance. The other is showing the role and agency that the local language and culture played in negotiating meaning when translating foreign terms and concepts. In addition, we would like to demonstrate, by using this example, how the examination of revolutionary terminology could help explain whether the use of emotive terms led to hostile relationships between various political groups.

A critical examination of the term *ywdām* that was featured very frequently in slogans of almost all the political organizations of the first three years of the revolution is used. The infinitive form of the word is *wäddämä*, “be demolished,” and it is commonly employed as *ywdām*, “let it be demolished,” as an equivalent for the English “down with.” Moreover, this term is used to demonstrate and document how the meanings of terms change according to the dictates of the socio-historical condition in which they are used. We try to examine the word and its use with regards to its etymology, semantics, and mismatch in translation. This in turn will help us unravel the political implications of the repeated use of the term in slogans and other mediums of official and unofficial discourse.

Let us demonstrate some examples of the use of the term in slogans of the time:

(a) *Democracia*¹⁸

“የውጭ ባስ ከበርቴዎች ጥገኛ የሆነው የባሳባቶች ሳርኦት ደጋፊዎች ይውደሙ!!!”

“yāwəč’ balä käbbärtewoč t’əggäña yāhonāw yäbalabbatoč sər’at dägga fiwoč ywdāmu!!!”

“Down with Imperialism and its feudal dependents!!!”

(b) *Addis Zemen*¹⁹

“ለውጡን የሚቃወሙ ጨርሰው ይውደሙ!!!”

“läwt’un yämiqqawwämu č’ärressāw ywdāmu!!!”

“Let the opponents of the revolution be eliminated once and for all!!!”

(c) The timeless and most famous slogan of the Derg:

“ኢትዮጵያ ትቅደም አቆርቁዋቸዋ ይውደም!!!”

“Ityopiya tk’dām aqorqoḳwa ywdām!!!”

“Ethiopia first and down with its exploiters!!!”

In what follows, we try to look at the linguistic examination of the term *wäddämä*, “be demolished,” from different angles.

(i) The Semantics of *wäddämä*, “be demolished”

The original meaning of the word denotes demolishment, elimination, or total annihilation of a (big) concrete, inanimate object (e.g., house, bridge, etc.). For example, Wolf Leslau’s *Concise Amharic-English English-Amharic Dictionary*²⁰ defines the word as “to be demolished, be leveled to the ground.” During the revolution, this word was redefined to mean “down with.” The word was employed in order to denounce a political group or their ideas (see examples above). The choice and use of the term that has such a negatively charged meaning indicates the animosity and hatred between the different political groups of the time. In addition, the preference of such a loaded term may also reveal how the different political groups perceived each other when they belonged to different camps.

(ii) The Mismatch in Translation

The second point worth noting is the mismatch in meaning that was observed between the Amharic word and its English equivalent from which it was translated. There is a substantial difference in meaning between *wäddämä*, “be demolished” and its English equivalent “down with.” For instance, “Down with Imperialism” is translated in Amharic as “Imperialism ywdām!” While the English expression shows the denigration of status, the Amharic equivalent shows total annihilation. Although the expressions in both languages are used to denounce, the degree to which they do so is substantially different. In connection with this, it should be mentioned that Amharic has the word *wärrädä*, “to step down,” which would have been a closer match to “down with.” Yet, *wäddämä*, “be demolished” carries a charged meaning that is purposely preferred. Once again, the conscious use of *wäddämä* in Amharic seems to suggest a greater level of hostility and ill-feeling among different political groups using the term to denounce each other. This also shows the domestication of the term “down with” in English to *wäddämä* as an

important case of local cultural reinterpretation of a foreign term which was used with a different meaning in its original form.

(iii) The Semantic Evolution of *wäddämä*, “be demolished”

Terms commonly undergo semantic change in languages. One common type of lexical semantic change is what is known as semantic widening (extension, generalization, broadening). We have noted that during the time of the revolution, the verb *wäddämä*, “be demolished” had undergone semantic widening. Four stages of semantic widening can roughly be identified. These are as follows:

Stage I: the demolishing of big, concrete, inanimate objects

In this case, the word expresses its original denotation, which is the destruction of big, concrete, and inanimate objects.

e.g., “hns’aw ywdäm!” (“Let the building be demolished!”)

Stage II: the demolishing of a system or an organization

In the second stage, the range of the meaning of the word *wäddämä* expands from a demolishment of a “concrete” object to an “abstract” one. In the example below, the slogan shows the annihilation of a system.

e.g., “fiwdalizm ywdäm!” (“Down with Feudalism!”)

Stage III: the demolishing of a group

Once again, the scope of the word in this case is generalized to cover a group of people. In other words, there is an extension of meaning from a destruction of a system to a destruction of a group of people.

e.g., “s’ärä hzboč ywdämu!” (“Down with the enemy of the people!”)

Stage IV: the “demolishing” of prominent personalities and the gentry

At this stage, there is widening of the word’s meaning from a group of individuals to a single individual who is considered important. For instance, during the time of the revolution, there were slogans like the following.

e.g., “Haylä Səllasse ywdäm!” (“Down with Haile Selassie!”)

The use of slogans like the example above indicates that the emperor was considered as the system itself. In relation to this, it is also noted that the range of the meaning of the word *wäddämä* has been slightly broadened to refer to other agent individuals of the so-called “Feudal” system of Ethiopia, as can be observed in the following example.

e.g., “S’ähay ənqqusəlasse ywdäm!” (“Down with Tsehay Enkuselase!”)

The four stages provided above clearly show that the meaning of the word *wäddämä* has extended from referring to the destruction of a big concrete object to an individual. Note that in presenting the four stages, we are not suggesting in any way that there is no overlap among the four stages of semantic expansion.

The semantic widening observed in connection with *wäddämä* is believed to amplify the effect of the meaning when it is applied to a single individual or a group. It is easy to notice the kind of effect that the use of the term *wäddämä*, “be demolished,” which is originally employed to signify the destruction of concrete, inanimate, and huge objects, might create when it is applied to groups of people or individuals. Such potent terms like *wäddämä* were employed over and over again in order to effect mass mobilization and urge people into political action.

(iv) The Linguistic Construction in which the Slogan is Formulated in Amharic is Jussive

Jussive construction is defined as a grammatical mood of verbs for issuing orders or commands. In the linguistics literature, it has been frequently mentioned that the jussive mood as a grammatical construction is known to encourage a course of action. Notice that slogans in Amharic appear in jussive construction. To this end, the use of the term *wäddämä* in jussive construction shows that the discourse promotes action. In addition to this, it should be mentioned that in Amharic the same jussive construction is employed in cursing, which suggests domestication. Once again, we believe that this is another instance of the reinterpretation of the local culture on a foreign concept and terminology.

e.g., “fiwdalizm y-wdäm!” (“Down with Feudalism!”)

Conclusion

In this paper, we argued that terms as sites of memory and remembrance should be given serious scholarly attention. The term that we have tried to work through and analyze in this study, *ywdām*, is just an example and is used to demonstrate that the study of revolutionary terminology could be a way in which we can understand the nature of political discourse and the consequences that such a discourse have on our recent history.

This study tried to show that terms do not only serve as sites of continuity in political discourse, but are also subject to redefinition by social, political, and temporal conditions and circumstances. Political culture is a function of both socio-political relations and political discourse and is language-dominant at a given time in history. We have tried to show in this study that the term *wāddāmā* had undergone various semantic changes due to the dictates of the historical, social, and political conditions in which the term was used. The kind of political discourse and protocol of utterance of a given historical period determines the tone as well as meanings of the vocabularies and terminologies that are commonly used at that time.

The importance of understanding space, in our case urban space, and the dynamics attendant to it, and the pivotal role that urban spaces play in the formulation and dissemination of political discourse have also been the other major concern of this study. We also tried to indicate, even if tentatively, the link between political discourse and political culture.

Most of the academic literature on terminology focuses on making commentaries on terminology dictionaries or how new terms are used in Amharic. No attempt is made to analyze the terms themselves and make sense of meaning carried from the local culture or ones that are foreign. Nor are there attempts made to understand the implications of these terms. This paper, on the other hand, attempted to show the political implications of revolutionary terms and how the local language (Amharic) negotiated meaning during the process of translation, by using the example of *ywdām* “let it be demolished, down with.” With more terms under such examination, the extent to which old meaning is carried, via terms and the agency of the local language and culture in manipulating new terms/concepts, as well as the implications these terms had on the political culture of the revolution could be brought out.

Moreover, all four points given above in relation to the use of the term *ywdām* (as an Amharic equivalent of “down with”) in slogans, official documents, and the media suggest that the meaning of the term has been consciously or unconsciously appropriated by the local language. This term and other terms used in such mediums, both by the state and the civilian opposition, show extreme animosity towards those outside of one's own party/affiliation. Words like *ywdām* (“let it be demolished, down with”), *s’ürä* (“anti”), *sāw bälaw* (“cannibalistic”), *fašist* (“fascist”), were used against groups who were considered enemies. We believe such extreme hostility has contributed to the horrors of the early years of the revolution and led to bloodshed between the revolutionaries.

REFERENCES

PUBLISHED MATERIALS

- Demoz, Abraham. “European Loanwords in an Amharic Daily Newspaper.” In *Language in Africa*, edited by J. Spencer, 116–22. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1963.
- Demoz, Abraham. “Problems of Terminology in Modern Amharic.” *Congresso Internazionale di Studi Etiopici* 4, no. 2 (1974): 215–21.
- Fulass, Hailu. “Problems of Terminology,” In *Language Use and Social Change*, edited by W. H. Whitely, 309–17. London, Oxford University Press, 1971.
- Holloway, Julian and James Kneale. “Mikhail Bakhtin: dialogics of space.” In *Thinking Space*, edited by Mike Crang, and Nigel Thrift, 71–88. London: Routledge, 2000.
- Kapeliuk, Olga. “Marxist-Leninist Terminology in Amharic and in Tigrinya.” *Northeast African Studies* 1, no. 2 (1979): 23–30.
- Leslau, Wolf. “Toward a History of the Amharic Vocabulary.” *Journal of Ethiopian Studies* 2, no. 2 (1964): 12–20.
- Leslau, Wolf. “While Working on the English-Amharic Context Dictionary.” *Congresso Internazionale di Studi Etiopici* 4, no. 2 (1974): 203–13.
- Taddesse Tamrat. *Church and State in Ethiopia, 1270–1527*. Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1972.
- Wa Thiong’o, Ngũgĩ. *Something Torn and New: An African Renaissance*. New York: Basic Civitas Books, 2009.
- Yä ityop’iyawīyan yä yuniversity māmḥāran yāwəyayət mahbär. *Täramaj mägäbä qalat*. Addis Ababa: Tiqəmt 1969 E.C (October 1976).

UNPUBLISHED MATERIALS

Həzbawī Haylētāt Harənnāt Ertra, ‘Mahdärä qalat’, meda (Unpublished, typewritten: 1975)

Yäwəč’ balä käbbärtew t’əggäña yāhonāw yäbalabbatoč sər’at däggaŋfiwoč ywdämu.

NOTES

We would like to acknowledge financial support from the Office of the Vice President for Research and School of Graduate Studies, Addis Ababa University to undertake this study. We also wish to extend our heartfelt appreciation for insightful comments and encouragement by Prof. Anthony Bogues, Prof. Geri Augusto, and Dr. Ronny Meyer. All remaining errors however are ours.

1. Revolutionary language has been used in the liberation struggles for independence and after independence in Africa and other parts of the world. A typical example closer to home is post-independence Tanzania up to the 1980s. This period in Tanzania witnessed significant widening of the political lexicon of Kiswahili with the coinage of terms such as freedom (*uhuru*), socialism (*ujamaa*), imperialism (*ubeberu*) and so on.
2. Messay Kebede, *Radicalization and Cultural Dislocation in Ethiopia, 1960–1974* (Rochester, NY: University of Rochester Press, 2008).
3. Pierre Bourdieu, *Language and Symbolic Power* (Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press, 1991), 2, 9.
4. Julian Holloway and James Kneale, “Mikhail Bakhtin: dialogics of space,” in *Thinking Space*, ed. Mike Crang and Nigel Thrift (London: Routledge, 2000), 71–88.
5. Holloway and Kneale, “Mikhail Bakhtin.”
6. Holloway and Kneale, “Mikhail Bakhtin,” 77–78.
7. Mike Savage, “Walter Benjamin’s Urban Thought: a Critical Analysis,” in *Thinking Space*, ed. Crang and Thrift, 33–53.
8. Andy Merrifield, “Henri Lefebvre: a Socialist in Space,” in *Thinking Space*, ed. Crang and Thrift, 167–82.
9. The Red Terror was basically a carnage that affected mainly the urban centers of the country. The young and urban were the primary victims of

this period of terror that started in 1976 but reached its height following the February 1977 *coup d'état* that brought Mengistu Haile Mariam to the helm of power as the chairman of the Provisional Military Administrative Council.

10. Olga Kapeliuk, "Language Policy in Ethiopia Since the Revolution of 1974," *Asian and African Studies* 14, no. 13 (1980): 269–78.
11. Kapeliuk, "Language Policy"; and Joseph Tubiana, "Brave New Words: Linguistic Innovation in the Social and Economic Vocabulary of Amharic Since 1960," *Journal of Semetic Studies* 30, no. 1 (1985): 85–93.
12. Wolf Leslau, *Concise Amharic-English English-Amharic Dictionary* (Addis Ababa: Shama Books, 2005), Second Edition, 207–8. Examples of a local expression of loan terms include: feudal (*yemeret balabat*), bourgeois (*käbärte*), petty bourgeois (*nə'us käbärte*), ideology (*rə'yotä alām*) and many others. All these terms have been used in the literature in their original form (as in *bourgeois*), but at other times their Amharic translations are used instead of the loan terms. As indicated by Abraham Demoz using alternative Amharic expressions both for "technical and non-technical terms" in place of loanwords was a widespread practice in Ethiopia, e.g., plan (*əqəd*) and percent (*kämäto*), etc. And he argues that this was due to "lack of standardization" of translations. See his "Problems of Terminology in Modern Amharic," 217.
13. Examples of duplicate local expressions and translations to newly introduced terms and concepts include the following: the broad masses (*bəzuhanu*, *säfiw həzb*); the peasantry (*arso adäru*, *afär gäfiw*); exploitation (*məzbära*, *gäfäfa*, *bəzbäza*). See Amsalu Aklilu, "Yäwəč' qwanqwa s'ənsä hasab tärğum bä amarəña," *Journal of Ethiopian Studies* 14, no. 1 (1980): 4.
14. Amsalu Aklilu, "Yäwəč' qwanqwa," 1–25. The most obvious reason for this is the background church education of many literary people and linguists in the country, in which Ge'ez is central. To mention a few of the most prominent ones, Yohannis Admasu (the chief author of *Täramaj mǝzgäbä qalat*), Amsalu Aklilu (a prominent linguist who has been involved in many dictionary preparations), Debebe Seifu (prominent poet and revolutionary of the period of revolution), and many others.
15. Kapeliuk, "Language Policy," 278.
16. Kapeliuk, "Language Policy," 26.
17. A typical example in this respect could be the prefix *s'ärä* (lit. anti). It was used with other terms as in *s'ärä-abyot* (lit. anti-revolution), *s'ärä-həzb* (lit.

anti-people and has an imperfect equivalence in “enemy of the people”), *s’ärä-fiwdal* (lit. anti-feudal), very frequently in slogans, texts, etc. The prefix *s’ärä* when used to signify nouns such as *həzb* (people or the masses) take on the absolute religious connotation that for the masses/the people to exist their adversaries, the *s’ärä həzb* should be eliminated, as the one cannot live with the other. *S’ärä* has historically been used for example in association with other nouns especially *maryam*, as in *s’ärä maryam*. This term is used to indict those who are accused of not believing in St. Mary’s status as the mother of God and her ability to intercede on behalf of humanity. This was a very serious accusation in the old days, and those who were accused of the offence were severely dealt with and persecuted. See Tadesse Tamrat, *Church and State in Ethiopia, 1270–1527*, on Däqiqä Esifanos, a head of the Gunda Gunde monastery accused of being *s’ärä maryam*.

18. *Democracia*, No. 1, 1966 (Unpublished leaflet: Institute of Ethiopian Studies Manuscript Section), 2.
19. “Läwt’un yämiqawämu č’ärəsäw ywdämu,” *Addis Zemen* 34, no. 556 (Hidar 6, 1967 E.C.), 3.
20. Leslau, *Dictionary*, 174.